

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action in the present application. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

The application as examined included claims 383-392. Claims 1-382 are previously cancelled. Claims 383, and 388-392 are currently amended. Claims 384-387 are unchanged. New claims 393-396 are added.

Claims 383-392 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b), as being anticipated by Field et al. (U.S. 6,253,324).

Field describes a method of verifying the integrity of client programs that request services from server programs.

Applicant expresses appreciation to Examiner Arezoo Sherkat and Examiner Taghi Arani for the courtesy of an interview which was granted to applicant's representative, Sanford T. Colb (Reg. No. 26,856). The interview was held at the USPTO on August 9, 2006. The substance of the interview is set forth in the Interview Summary.

At the interview, the patentability of claim 383 was discussed vis-à-vis the prior art of Field et al. The Interview Summary states, in relevant part, "Applicant's representative, Mr. Colb, suggested an amendment to claim 383 which overcomes the cited prior art, namely Field et al., and subjects the amended claim to further consideration and search by the Examiner. Examiner

introduced a newly discovered prior art, namely U.S. 6,598,034 (Kloth) and recommended Mr. Colb to review and consider it before submitting any amendments.

As discussed at the interview, applicant has amended claim 383 as suggested to more clearly define the present invention. Applicant has made similar amendments to claims 388 and 391-392. Applicant has also amended claims 389 and 390 to provide proper antecedent basis for all elements claimed therein based on the amendments to claim 388.

Applicant respectfully submits that Field et al does not show or suggest a method including, inter alia, classifying an incoming data object according to whether the incoming data object includes executable code or does not include executable code and routing the incoming data object to a virus detection system if the classifying indicates that the incoming data object includes executable code, as recited in claims 383 and 391. Applicant respectfully submits that Field et al does not show or suggest a router apparatus including computerized virus detection functionality, computerized data object classifying functionality operative to classify a data object according to whether the data object includes executable code or does not include executable code and computerized routing functionality, separate from said computerized virus detection functionality, for routing said data object to the computerized virus detection functionality if the computerized data object classifying functionality indicates that the data object includes executable code, as recited in claims 388 and 392.

As suggested by the Examiner, applicant has also considered the prior art reference cited at the interview. Kloth describes an apparatus and method providing a routing engine for processing data packets based upon rules that are applied and compiled real-time.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kloth does not show or suggest a method including, inter alia, classifying an incoming data object according to whether the incoming data object includes executable code or does not include executable code and routing the incoming data object to a virus detection system if the classifying indicates that the incoming data object includes executable code, as recited in claims 383 and 391. Applicant respectfully submits that Kloth does not show or suggest a router apparatus including computerized virus detection functionality, computerized data object classifying functionality operative to classify a data object according to whether the data object includes executable code or does not include executable code and computerized routing functionality, separate from said computerized virus detection functionality, for routing said data object to the computerized virus detection functionality if the computerized data object classifying functionality indicates that the data object includes executable code, as recited in claims 388 and 392.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that independent claims 383, 388 and 391-392 are therefore patentable.

Applicant has added new dependent claims 393-396 which are similar in scope to claims 389-390.

Claims 384-387 depend from claim 383 and recite additional patentable matter and are therefore deemed allowable. Claims 389-390 and 393-396 depend from claim 388 and recite additional patentable matter and are therefore deemed allowable.

Applicant reserves the right to pursue the claims as filed in the context of a continuation application.

In view of the foregoing, all of the claims are deemed to be allowable. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Dated: August 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

S. Peter Ludwig

Registration No.: 25,351

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant